REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on April 19, 2006 and is being filed pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) as provided under 37 CFR 1.114. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-20 were previously canceled. Claims 35, 37 and 40-45 are canceled in the present response. Claims 21, 23-28, 30, 34, 36 and 38-39 have been amended. No new claims have been added. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - §112

Claims 21, 27 and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the term "relative" is indefinite and fails to distinctly point out to one skilled in the art, how the fields are to appear (Final Office Action, page 2). Without admitting to the propriety of the §112 rejections, Applicant amended claims 21, 27 and 34. Therefore, the issue of whether the term "relative" makes the claims indefinite is moot.

Claim Rejections - §102

Independent claims 21, 27 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on U.S. Patent no. 5,612,898 of Huckins ("Huckins"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As presented in the response to the previous office action mailed on 11/17/2005, the present invention generally relates to a method and apparatus that allow pre-configuration of the logging of message fields by a network cache. Among other

features, embodiments of the invention allow including or excluding particular message

fields from a log format for subsequently received messages and allow specification of

the order in which each particular field will appear in a log file.

For example, claim 34 provides:

34. A device for logging information in a network cache, the device comprising:
an interface to allow selection of a protocol, **selection of some or all of a plurality of fields of a message to be received for logging,** the fields corresponding to the selected protocol, and **specification of a sequence in which the selected fields are to appear in a log file;**
a protocol specific application module to obtain information for each selected field associated with the message;
a protocol independent log module to receive information for each selected field from the protocol specific application module and to store the information for each selected field in a log file **in the sequence specified.**
(Emphasis added.)

Huckins does not disclose or even suggest a device such as recited in claim 34.

In particular, Huckins does not disclose or suggest selecting particular fields of a

message for logging, and specifying a sequence in which the selected fields are to

appear in a log file. Moreover, Huckins also does not disclose or suggest that a

protocol independent log module receives information for each selected field from a

protocol specific application module and stores the information for each selected field in

a log file in the specified sequence.

Huckins provides a client logging interface with which client components may

periodically transfer log data or messages to a log file to provide a debug tracing log of

the execution of the client component (Huckins, column 2, lines 9-13). Huckins,

however, does not teach or suggest selecting particular fields of a message for logging and specifying a sequence in which the selected fields are to appear in a log file.

In the remarks section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner refers to Huckins' column 2 lines 31-34 and alleges that Huckins teaches that a user is able to customize what is logged. Huckins' column 2 lines 31-34 disclose that the system in Huckins is dynamically configurable for monitoring interface protocols. The discussion there, however, does not teach or suggest that the logging process in Huckins is customized as the way recited in claim 34, namely, selecting some or all of a plurality of fields of a message to be received for logging and specifying a sequence in which the selected fields are to appear in a log file.

The Examiner further alleges that Huckins teaches what elements should not be logged and refers to column 7 lines 7-23 as support. The cited part of Huckins, however, discloses a means for inhibiting logging events in certain event categories, not selecting particular fields of a message for logging.

Also as presented in the response to the previous office action mailed on 11/17/2005, Huckins also does not disclose or suggest that a protocol independent log module receives information for each selected field from a protocol specific application module and stores the information for each selected field in a log file in the sequence specified. The Examiner incorrectly cites Huckins as disclosing this functionality at column 2 lines 31-41. Although column 2 lines 31-41 in Huckins state that the system in Huckins provides a means for variably outputting logged data in various selectable display formats, later discussion in Huckins discloses that such format may be binary or hex format (huckins, column 5, lines 54-60, column 7, lines 24-36, and column 8, lines

40-44), and it does not teach or suggest that information for each selected field is stored in a log file in a specified <u>sequence</u>.

Therefore, at least for the foregoing reasons, claim 34 is not anticipated by Huckins.

Each of the other independent claims in the present application includes one or more of the claim features discussed above and is, therefore, patentable over the cited art for reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 6/27/06

Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 48102
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300